

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/786,501	02/25/2004	Susan L. Acton	MP198-052P1RDV10DV1M	3988	
30405	7590 03/28/2006		EXAMINER		
	IUM PHARMACEUT	MONSHIPOURI, MARYAM			
40 Landsdov CAMBRIDO	vne Street GE, MA 02139		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,		1653		
			DATE MAIL ED: 02/28/2006		

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2000

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		01	ACTON, SUSAN L.					
			Art Unit					
		1onshipouri	1653					
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	ication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF TH of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ev unication. atutory period will apply and w will, by statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tim	I. sely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on .							
,	2b)⊠ This action is r	on-final.						
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>49-6</u> is/are pending in the	application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>49-61</u> are subject to restric	8) Claim(s) 49-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)				

Art Unit: 1653

Applicant's response to restriction letter filed 3/14/2006 is acknowledged.

Applicant elected Group III invention without traverse. However, upon review of the previous office action and currently pending claims further restriction deemed necessary as following (applicant regrets any inconvenience that said restriction letter may have caused applicant):

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group III(a). Claims 49-60 and 63-64, drawn to drawn to antibodies which bind CSAPK and kits comprising said products, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.

Group III (b) . Claims 61-62, drawn to methods of detecting said CSAPK polypeptides utilizing said antibodies, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case kinase assay solutions may be utilized to detect said polypeptides in the mthod of Group II, which are totally different products than antibodies of Group I.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,501

Art Unit: 1653

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or other wise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provision of MPEP section 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and he rejoined process will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104, Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined clams must meet all the criteria for patentability including the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an alerted product claims is

Application/Control Number: 10/786,501

Art Unit: 1653

found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined, See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. section 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86(March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include limitations of the product claim. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP section 804.01.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Application/Control Number: 10/786,501

Art Unit: 1653

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maryam Monshipouri whose telephone number is (571) 272-0932. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m to 4:30 p.m. except for alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weber Jon P. can be reached on (571) 272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A Marshi

Maryam Monshipouri Ph.D.

Primary Examiner